PROPOSED COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE	
For Calendar Year: 2004	
Continuing	
New	
Previous Year (below line/defer)	

NUMBER CDD-9

Issue: Re-establishment and Amortization of non-conforming, non-residential uses and

structures

Lead Department: Community Development

General Plan Element or Sub-Element: Land Use and Transportation Element

1. What are the key elements of the issue? What precipitated it?

The re-establishing of non-conforming non-residential uses and structures has been considered by the City Council from time to time over recent years. Current regulations allow the reconstruction of legal non-conforming residential uses and buildings if they are accidentally damaged and are reconstructed within one year (and not abandoned or vacant for six months). Sunnyvale Municipal Code (Chapter 19.50) is more restrictive for non-residential buildings and uses than for residential. The Code does not allow non-residential buildings to be rebuilt, or for the non-conforming use to continue, if damage exceeds 50% of the value of the building. The Council has not adopted any changes to this regulation in previous studies.

In 2003, the above study issue was combined with a study to consider the opposite requirement for the amortization of non-conforming, non-residential uses potentially resulting in the eventual removal. This part of the item will also examine revisions to the permit process requiring periodic review and/or removal of non-conforming, non-residential uses.

The prohibition against re-establishing a damaged non-conforming use or building is a common zoning tool to assist a community in achieving compliance with the general plan and zoning for an area. Staff notes that because the zoning code allows the continued use of a non-conforming use (not requiring amortization), protection is afforded most businesses in non-conforming situations. New requirements that restrict existing non-conforming uses or buildings may negatively influence the existing and future businesses' intention to operate within the City.

For 2003, the study was deferred by the City Council.

2. How does this relate to the General Plan or existing City Policy?

Land Use and Transportation Element

Policy N.1.1 Protect the integrity of the City's neighborhoods; whether residential, industrial or commercial.

Policy N1.3 Support a full spectrum of conveniently located commercial, public and quasi-public uses that add to the positive image of the City.

Economic Development

Policy 5.1C4 Promote business opportunities and retention in Sunnyvale.

3.	Origin of issue:					
	Councilmember:	Roberts, R	Risch			
	General Plan:					
	Staff:					
	BOARD or COMMISSION					
	Arts			Library		
	Bldg. Code of Appeal	s 🗌		Parks & Rec.		
	CCAB			Personnel		
	Heritage & Preservati	on 🗌]	Planning		
	Housing & Human Sv	cs 🗌				
	Board / Commission Ranking/Comment:					
Board / Commission ranked of					of	
4.	Due date for Continui	ng and Ma	andatory	issues (if knov	vn):	
5.	Multiple Year Project?	Yes 🗌	No 🖂	Expected Year	r of Complet	tion 2004

6.	Estimated work hours for com	npletion	of the study issue.				
	(a) Estimated work hours fron	3	350				
	(b) Estimated work hours fron						
	(c) Estimated work hours from the City Attorney's Office:				40		
	(d) List any other department(s) and number of work hours:						
	Department(s):						
	Total Estimated Hours:			3	90		
7.	Expected participation involved in the study issue process?						
	(a) Does Council need to appr	ove a w	vork plan?	Yes 🗌	No 🖂		
	(b) Does this issue require rev Board/Commission?	view by	a	Yes 🖂	No 🗌		
	If so, which Board/Commission? Planning Commission						
	(c) Is a Council Study Session anticipated?			Yes 🖂	No 🗌		
	(d) What is the public participation	ation pr	ocess?				
expe adve	cus meeting with the public may ectations of non-residential pertisements will be a part of this Council public hearings.	roperty	owners. Standa	ard noticing	g and		
8.	Estimated Fiscal Impact:						
	Cost of Study	\$	0				
	Capital Budget Costs	\$	0				
	New Annual Operating Costs	\$	0				
	New Revenues or Savings	\$	0				
	10 Year RAP Total	\$	0				
9.	Staff Recommendation						
	Recommende						
	☐ Against Study						
		ndation					

Explain below staff's recommendation if "for" or "against" study. Department director should also note the relative importance of this study to other major projects that the department is currently working on or that are soon to begin, and the impact on existing services/priorities.

reviewed by				
Department Director	Date			
approved by				
City Manager	Date			